

## **REMARKS**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed January 25, 2005. Claims 1-14 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. Claims 7-11 are being canceled herein. Claims 1-6 and 12-14 are being amended. Claims 1-6 and 12-14 remain for the Examiner's consideration, with claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 12 and 14 being independent. Based on the following remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and objections are respectfully requested.

### **I. Specification**

The specification was objected to because "5N" in paragraph [0085] should have been "5B". An appropriate amendment has been made. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

### **II. Election/Restriction**

Applicants are affirming the provisional election of the Group I claims (1-6 and 12-14), and are canceling the Group II claims (7-11) without prejudice or disclaimer of the inventions therein. Applicants reserve the right to pursue these canceled claims in a continuing application.

### **III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because claim 2 depended from itself. Claim 2 has been amended to depend from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 112 rejection.

### **IV. Double Patenting**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 12, and 13 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 11, 12, 23 and 24 of copending application Serial No. 10/278,193. Applicants do not necessarily agree with this

rejection. When there is an indication that claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 12, and 13 are otherwise allowable, Applicants may consider filing a Terminal Disclaimer.

#### **V. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 3, 6 and 14 would be allowable if a proper terminal disclaimer were filed. These claims have been redrafted to be in independent form. Because these claims were not included in the above mentioned double patenting rejection, Applicants do not believe a Terminal Disclaimer is required for their allowance.

#### **VI. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Borysiak (U.S. Patent No. 4,284,420). While Applicants do not agree with this rejection, Applicants have made minor amendments to independent claims 1, 4 and 12 to better distinguish embodiments of the present invention, and thereby expedite issuance of a patent. For the convenience of the Examiner, claim 1, as amended, is reproduced below.

1. *A method for cleaning a first group of electrodes contained within an air conditioner housing, wherein a removable second group of electrodes within the air conditioner housing has a cleaning device fastened with the second group of electrodes, which also engage the first group of electrodes, the method comprising, in any order:*

*(a) removing the second group of electrodes from the air conditioner housing; and*

*(b) replacing the second group of electrodes back into the air conditioner housing.*

Claim 1 is directed toward a method "for cleaning a first group of electrodes contained within an air conditioner housing, wherein a removable second group of electrodes within the air conditioner housing has a cleaning device fastened with the second group of electrodes, which also engage the first

group of electrodes". The method comprises, in any order "(a) removing the second group of electrodes from the air conditioner housing" and "(b) replacing the second group of electrodes back into the air conditioner housing".

As mentioned above. It was alleged in the Office Action that Borysiak anticipates claim 1. However, as can be seen from FIGS. 3, 6 and 1 of Borysiak, Borysiak does not teach or suggest removing any of its electrodes from the housing 56 and/or replacing any of its electrodes into the housing 56. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Borysiak does not anticipate claim 1, or its dependent claim 2.

For similar reasons to those just explained above with regards to claims 1 and 2, Applicants also believe that Borysiak does not anticipate claims 4 and 5, and claims 12 and 13.

#### **VIII. Conclusion**

In light of the above, it is respectfully requested that all outstanding rejections and objections be reconsidered and withdrawn. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment of fees or credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 (order no. SHPR-01361USL) for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/31/05

By: Jeffrey R. Kurin  
Jeffrey R. Kurin  
Reg. No. 41,132

FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-4156  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800  
Facsimile: (415) 362-2928  
Customer No. 23910